



Metropolitan King County *Countywide Planning Policies* Benchmark Program  
1998 King County Benchmark Report

## Acknowledgments

The Benchmark Team wants to thank the following persons for their contributions to the Benchmark Report.

Mark Aalfs  
Norm Abbott  
Bonnie Binner  
Eileen Bleeker  
Mark Busher  
James Callahan  
Jean Carpenter  
Derald Christensen  
Margaret Clark  
Doug Clinton  
Elsie Crossman  
Betsy Czark  
Martin Dicker  
Bill Eckel  
Chandler Felt  
Mark Finch  
Bruce Florey  
Kate Galloway  
Villamor Gamponia  
David George  
Gavin Gray  
Carol Gregory  
Gary Grieve

Kamuron Gurol  
Azim Sheikh Hari  
Gary Hassler  
Jeff Haymes  
Trish Heinonen  
Gayle Hendensten  
Aaron Hoard  
Mary Hoffman  
George Horning  
Clair Impett  
Lynae Jacobson  
Randy Jeffrey  
Eric Jensen  
Rick Judd  
Neil Kilgren  
Jackie Kirn  
Don Largen  
Roberta Lewendowski  
Linda Longmire  
Ikuno Masterson  
Nanette Morales  
Ray Moser  
Beth Mountsier

Steve Munson  
Steve Nolen  
Brad North  
Rob Odle  
Kevin O'Neill  
Kate O'Laughlin  
Linda Pierce  
Gary Prince  
Ray Pullar  
Jim Record  
Nick Roach  
Labh Sachdev  
Mark Sharp  
Carol Smith  
Pat Talton  
Nancy Tosta  
Pat Steel  
Cynthia Stewart  
Bill Tweit  
Donna Velasco  
Mitch Wasserman  
Pat Whittaker



Metropolitan King County *Countywide Planning Policies* Benchmark Program  
 1998 King County Benchmark Report

## Outcomes and Indicators

**Outcome:** The ultimate goal or objective. *Example: Increase Income and Reduce Poverty.*

**Indicator:** The item that is measured to show progress toward achieving the vision of the Countywide Planning Policies. *Example: Percentage of population below the poverty level.*

### ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

#### Outcomes

PROMOTE FAMILY-WAGE JOBS  
 INCREASE INCOME AND REDUCE POVERTY

INCREASE BUSINESS FORMATION, EXPANSION AND  
 RETENTION

CREATE JOBS THAT ADD TO KING COUNTY'S ECONOMIC  
 BASE  
 INCREASE EDUCATIONAL SKILL LEVELS

#### Indicators

1. Real wages per worker.
2. Personal and median household income: King County compared to the United States.
3. Percentage of population below the poverty level.
4. New businesses created.
5. New jobs created by employment sector.
6. Employment in industries that export from the region.
7. Educational background of adult population.
8. High school graduation rate.

### ENVIRONMENT

#### Outcomes

PROTECT AND ENHANCE NATURAL ECOSYSTEMS

IMPROVE AIR QUALITY

PROTECT WATER QUALITY AND QUANTITY

PROTECT WETLANDS  
 PROTECT THE DIVERSITY OF PLANTS AND WILDLIFE

INCREASE SALMON STOCK  
 DECREASE NOISE LEVELS

DECREASE WASTE DISPOSAL AND INCREASE RECYCLING

#### Indicators

9. Land cover changes in urban and rural areas over time.
  10. Air quality.
  11. Energy consumption.
  12. Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per year.
  13. Surface water and groundwater quality.
  14. Water consumption.
  15. Change in groundwater levels. \*
  16. Change in wetland acreage and functions.
  17. Continuity of terrestrial and aquatic habitat networks. \*
  18. Change in number of salmon.
  19. Rate of increase in noise from vehicles, planes and yard equipment.
  20. Pounds of waste disposed and recycled per capita.
- \*Indicators for which no data currently exists.*

KING COUNTY  
BENCHMARKS



Metropolitan King County *Countywide Planning Policies* Benchmark Program

## 1998 King County Benchmark Report

### AFFORDABLE HOUSING

#### Outcomes

PROVIDE SUFFICIENT AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR ALL KING COUNTY RESIDENTS

PROMOTE AFFORDABLE HOME OWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES

PROMOTE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF AFFORDABLE LOW-INCOME HOUSING THROUGHOUT KING COUNTY

#### Indicators

21. Supply and demand for affordable housing
22. Percent of income paid for housing.
23. Homelessness.
26. Apartment vacancy rate.
24. Home purchase affordability gap for buyers with (a) median renter household income and (b) median household income.
25. Home ownership rate.
27. Trend of housing costs vs. income
28. Public dollars spent for low income housing.
29. Housing units affordable to low income households.

### LAND USE

#### Outcomes

ENCOURAGE A GREATER SHARE OF GROWTH IN URBAN AREAS AND URBAN CENTERS; LIMIT GROWTH IN RURAL/RESOURCE AREAS

MAKE EFFICIENT USE OF URBAN LAND

ACCOMMODATE RESIDENTIAL AND JOB GROWTH IN URBAN AREAS

ENCOURAGE LIVABLE, DIVERSE COMMUNITIES  
BALANCE JOB AND HOUSEHOLD GROWTH

MAINTAIN QUALITY AND QUANTITY OF NATURAL RESOURCE LANDS

#### Indicators

30. New housing units in Urban Areas and Rural/Resource areas, and in Urban Centers.
31. Employment in Urban Areas, Rural/Resource Areas, Urban Centers and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers.
32. New housing units built through redevelopment.
33. Ratio of land consumption to population growth.
34. Ratio of achieved density to allowed density of residential development.
35. Ratio of land capacity to 20 year household and job targets.
36. Land with 6 years of infrastructure capacity. \*
37. Acres of urban parks and open space.
38. Ratio of jobs to housing in Central Puget Sound Counties, and King County sub-regions.
39. Acres in forest land and farm land.
40. Number and average size of farms.

KING COUNTY  
BENCHMARKS



Metropolitan King County *Countywide Planning Policies* Benchmark Program  
1998 King County Benchmark Report

**TRANSPORTATION**

**Outcomes**

TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE LINKAGE

AVAILABILITY OF MODES OTHER THAN SINGLE  
OCCUPANT VEHICLE  
MODE SPLIT

REDUCE COMMERCIAL TRAFFIC CONGESTION

PROTECT AND IMPROVE TRANSPORTATION  
INFRASTRUCTURE

**Indicators**

41. Percent of residents who commute one-way within  
30 minutes.

42. Transit trips per person.

43. Percent of residents who walk or use transit, bicycles  
or carpools as alternatives to the single occupant vehicle.

44. Ability of goods and services to move efficiently and  
cost effectively through the region.

45. Number of lane miles of city, county, and state roads  
and bridges in need of repair and preservation.